

**ecology and environment, inc.**

111 WEST JACKSON BLVD., CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604, TEL. 312-663-9415

International Specialists in the Environment

M E M O R A N D U M

EPA Region 5 Records Ctr.



357012

DATE: January 18, 1985
TO: Rene Van Someren
FROM: Mike Gifford
SUBJECT: HRS Score for U.S. Army St. Louis Area Support Center
(SLASC) Granite City, Illinois
TDD R5-8303-01A; IL0189

On January 14, 1985, I had an extensive conversation with Steve Chang of the Mitre Corporation regarding the above referenced site. The previous Friday, January 11, Steve spoke with Jerry Oskvarek and relayed several questions he had about the HRS score for the SLASC. I previously compiled the necessary background information and documentation in March, 1984 and arrived at a score of 21.02.

Steve's primary concern was the absence of a reference, other than the CERCLA notification, documenting the hazardous waste volume. In addition, he had questions concerning a definition of the aquifer of concern; the nearest well to the site; the population served by the aquifer of concern; and surface water use, specifically the Mississippi River.

On the morning of January 14, 1985, I spoke with Steve by phone and we arranged a 1:00 meeting to discuss the issues. I then spent two hours refamiliarizing myself with the site and locating the references to answer his questions. I was puzzled over the sudden interest in the site since it only scored a 21.02, substantially below the cutoff score to make the NPL. I also concluded that Steve must be missing some of the HRS support documents because all of his questions were answered by reviewing the initial HRS package submitted to the U.S. EPA in early April, 1984.

I do admit the waste quantity documentation was "suspect"; however my reasoning was that maximizing the waste quantity was still not sufficient to qualify the site for the NPL. Consequently, I understood his concern with this issue; however I remained puzzled about the overall concern because there is not a substantial target population.

When we met at 1:00 p.m. I immediately discovered the source of the problem. Someone, presumably from the U.S. EPA, had changed the score to a 34.78. We (E & E) were never notified of a change in the score. Also, the person who made the change did not acknowledge their name and the change in score was based on a misinterpretation of the HRS model. If such a change in the score was warranted, further documentation of the waste quantity would then be required. However, with the score remaining below the NPL minimum, additional documentation would not be necessary.

MG:1X